Ghosts in the Machine

Benjamin James

May 21, 2026

There is a moment, often unremarkable in itself, when someone reaches for the phone to call a person who has been dead for years. Their hand is partway to the device before the recognition arrives. A particular smell, a cologne, a kitchen spice, the residue of a winter coat, produces a wave of feeling out of proportion to anything in one's immediate environment. A room once entered without thinking becomes the room that cannot be entered, even years after the person who occupied it has gone. These are not exotic experiences. They are ordinary, near-universal, and recognized in every culture that has ever bothered to name them. We call them hauntings.

To call them hauntings, however, is to invite a particular kind of dismissal. The modern mind has been trained to assign such language to one of two prepared categories. The first is literal supernatural belief, which serious people are expected to have outgrown. The second is metaphor, which is granted but treated as merely decorative, a way of speaking about psychology in inherited vocabulary that contributes nothing to understanding the underlying mechanism. Between these two slots, the older intuition that hauntings name something real and structural has nowhere to go. It is either a credulity to be debunked or a flourish to be tolerated. Neither response engages what is actually happening.

Both dismissals are wrong, and they are wrong in the same way. Both treat the question of haunting as a question about presence. The believer says yes, something is there; an incorporeal entity, a soul lingering, a spirit returning, or an undischarged ghost still bound to the place or the person. The debunker says no, nothing is there; the experience is misattribution, pattern-completion, neurological artifact, or grief in costume. The disagreement looks substantive but is structural agreement on the wrong frame. Both have accepted that the right question to ask of a haunting is whether or not there is something present. Both are answering at the wrong level.

Our popular supernatural frame is incoherent before it is mistaken. It requires a substance category, an incorporeal presence that is in some sense there but without occupying space in the way bodies do, that has no other use in our modern conceptual vocabulary; it explains nothing it could not otherwise explain and exists only to fill the slot our framing demands. The debunker, having accepted this framing, can only answer in the negative; no such substance exists, therefore no haunting exists. This conclusion satisfies the question and dissolves the phenomenon. It treats absence as refutation. It is also wrong, because the phenomenon is the absence, not something occupying it.

What is happening in the moment of reaching for the phone is not the presence of an incorporeal entity, and it is not the absence of any phenomenon at all. It is the continued firing of a response-pattern whose originating source has been deleted. The pattern was installed during the relationship, such as a predictive policy about whom to call when this kind of news arrives, an emotional response tuned to a particular cologne, or a behavioral routine attached to a particular room. The originator is gone. The substrate that runs the policy has not been updated, and there is nothing in the mechanism of conditioning that updates on a source's deletion. The substrate continues to execute. Nothing receives the execution. The gap between the firing and the missing receiver is what has always been called a ghost.

The phenomenon is the gap itself, structured. Nothing fills the gap. Nothing needs to. Our popular frame mislocates haunting by inventing an entity to occupy the absence, and so reads what is actually a response-against-nothing as a response-toward-something-incorporeal. The debunker mislocates it in the opposite direction, denying the entity and assuming the denial dispenses with the phenomenon. Both miss what is actually there, which is the absence itself, doing structural work. A ghost is a response-pattern executing against a deleted referent. The absence is the structure. Nothing else is required.

My earlier treatment of possession established that human beings are routinely moved by distributed patterns they do not originate, by social conditioning, ambient pressure, and institutional arrangements that have become embodied. Also, my essay on trauma observed that the body continues to behave as though an ended event were ongoing;

the past does not wound again, but the present keeps reopening the wound. The mechanism in both is the same. Repeated interaction installs predictive and behavioral policies in the substrates of the people around the source. Installation outlasts the originator. The substrate continues to execute those policies, fired by internal schedule or by external cue. The substrate has no introspective access to its own conditioning, so the firing presents as externally caused. The "incorporeal presence" is what introspective opacity feels like from inside. No new ontology is required.

What distinguishes a ghost from the cases already examined is the status of the source. Possession names capture by a pattern still receiving signal from active sources, such as ambient social conditioning, platform incentives, institutional pressure, and fast-cycle escalation among living participants. The pattern that captures the possessed individual is live. A demon, in this view, is a runaway feedback loop sustained by ongoing amplification among living substrates. Both name structural conditions in which something is happening through the person from a source that still exists. The capture is real, the source is real, and the analysis turns on identifying the live machinery that is doing the capturing.

A ghost is the case in which the source has been deleted. The originator is gone. The ambient field that maintained their pattern during the relationship is gone. The signal the policy was tracking no longer arrives; yet the substrate keeps executing. The cache has not been retired because nothing in our conditioning mechanism updates on the source's deletion. Extinction does not erase the original trace; it installs a competing one, and absent that competing installation, the original keeps firing against nothing. This is not a weaker form of possession. It is structurally distinct, and its distinguishing feature is precisely what our popular supernatural frame mislocates when it invents an entity to fill the gap.

Possession is capture by something that is. Ghosts are responses against something that is not. Our popular frame collapses them by reading ghosts as a thinner version of possession; the same kind of external influence, only made incorporeal and distant by death. The reading is wrong on the level of mechanism, not merely on the level of metaphysics. The ghost has no live source to be influenced by. The firing pattern has no

extant referent. The gap between the firing and the missing receiver is the entire phenomenon. Nothing fills the gap. Nothing needs to.

The mechanism produces two firing modes that our older folk vocabularies tracked as distinct conditions even when our modern term has flattened them. Habit-driven hauntings fire on internal schedule; anniversaries, ruminative cycles, autonomous loops in which the substrate generates its own triggers. Prompt-driven hauntings fire on external cue; a room, a smell, familiar handwriting, a stranger's gait that matches an old friend. Same underlying mechanism, two firing modes. Folk traditions that took hauntings seriously knew the difference and named it; our modern term that subsumes both has lost this resolution.

The phenomenon is preserved in full. Those who take hauntings seriously and those who treats them as illusion are forced to admit that something is happening; the disagreement is only about where to locate it. Locate it in an entity, and the explanation requires a substance category that has no other use than to satisfy our framing. Locate it in the substrate, and four well-understood steps account for the entire phenomenology, with no remainder. The austerity of the second option is what our older traditions were tracking with greater precision than the literalization that succeeded them has been willing to admit.

The keystone of our older vocabulary is also the most direct piece of evidence that the structural reading is not a modern reinterpretation but the original literal sense. To haunt, in English, is borrowed from Old French *hanter*, attested from the twelfth century, meaning to frequent, to be accustomed to, to attend, to indulge in, or to cultivate. The Middle English phrase *to haunte scole* meant simply to attend school. The earliest English uses, into the fourteenth century, describe practicing a craft habitually, busying oneself with a discipline, or taking part in something repeatedly. The English ghostly sense, to be visited by a spirit, is first attested in Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in 1590. The adjective *haunted* in the spectral sense follows in 1711. The phrase *haunted house* does not appear until 1733. The noun *haunt* meaning "a ghost" does not enter our language until 1843. Modern French *hantise*, the noun cognate, survives in current usage with its original meaning of obsession or a pattern one cannot stop returning to.

The Germanic etymology of *hanter* traces back to Proto-Germanic *haimatjanan*, "to bring home," kin to *haimaz*, "home," and to the Old English *hām* and *hāmettan*, "to provide housing to." A rival Romance etymology connects the word through Latin *habēre*, "to have, to hold," to *habit*, *inhabit*, and *habitation*. The two derivations differ in pathway but converge on the same semantic field. A haunt is a place repeatedly returned to. A habit is a behavior repeatedly performed. To inhabit is to dwell within. A haunting, in the original literal sense of the English word, was a habituation; a place or a person being frequented by a pattern, occupied by a practice, and returned to by a custom. The supernatural sense that has displaced its parent in contemporary English is a late and parochial extension of an older root that was tracking something entirely different.

This is not a hermeneutic flourish or a clever philological pun. It is the historical record about what the word meant for five centuries before Shakespeare repurposed it. The structural reading developed here is not a modern interpretation that recovers a hidden truth in the vocabulary. It is what the vocabulary literally said. The translucent figure haunting the hallway, the spectral image walking the moors, the disembodied entity that occupies the corner of the room, these are metaphors that ate their parent. The parent meant this place is being repeatedly entered by a pattern. This person is being repeatedly occupied by a practice. Modern English has spent four centuries gradually losing the resolution, and the loss has been thorough enough that recovering the original meaning now requires explicit philological work.

The same pattern repeats across the older vocabularies of every major tradition that has produced a word for ghost or spirit. The Old English *gāst*, the direct ancestor of the modern *ghost*, meant breath, animation, fierce excitement; the Proto-Germanic *gaistaz* traces to a Proto-Indo-European root meaning "to be agitated, frightened, excited." In Old English Christian writing, *gāst* rendered Latin *spiritus* and covered the entire semantic field of breath, animation, and agitation; the now-prevailing sense of "the soul of a deceased person, spoken of as appearing in a visible form" emerges only in Middle English in the fourteenth century. German *Geist* preserved the breadth of ghost, spirit, mind, and intellect, as in *Zeitgeist* and *Weltgeist*. Greek *pneuma* and Latin *spiritus* are both rooted in words for

breath; *pnein*, "to blow"; *spirare*, "to breathe." Hebrew *ruach* appears three hundred seventy-seven times in the Hebrew Bible meaning wind, breath, mood, disposition, and divine spirit; it cannot be reduced to "incorporeal entity" because it includes literal weather. Greek *psyche* derives from *psychein*, "to blow"; the same word names the butterfly, after the breath that flies from the mouth of the dying in Homer. The vocabulary across these languages does not name a substance. It names a pattern; the movement of breath, the agitation of life, the animating flow that constitutes a living being and ceases to flow when the being dies. The ghost-words began as breath-words. They were tracking the pattern of animation, not the thing that animates.

A second cluster of ghost-words names not breath but return or appearance. Latin *revenant* means "one returning." Old Norse *aptr-ganga* is "back-comer." The Greek *eidolon*, the word Homer uses for the ghost of Patroclus, derives from *eidos*, "form" or "appearance;" an image, not a substance. The Sanskrit *preta* is *pra-ita*, "gone forth." Latin *spectrum* and *specter* come from *specere*, "to look at"; the ghost is what is seen. The Old English *scin* and Old High German *giskin* originally meant "appearance," from the same root as *scinan*, "to shine." Polish *widmo* derives from *videti*, "to see." The pattern across these traditions is identical; the words do not name what a ghost is made of, because they were not asking that question. They name how a ghost presents as a returning, as an appearance, as a sight, or as a coming-back. Modality, not substance. Our folk vocabularies were tracking the mode of the phenomenon, not committing to its ontology. The literalist reading that asks "what is a ghost made of?" is answering a question older vocabularies never posed.

A third cluster names neither breath nor return but character itself. The Greek *daimōn* derives from a root commonly traced to *daiō*, "to divide, distribute", that which allots. In Hesiod, the *daimones* are the souls of the Golden Age acting as guardians. Heraclitus's fragment B119 makes the equation explicit; *ēthos anthrōpōi daimōn*, "character is, for a man, his daimon." The spirit is identified directly with habituated character. Socrates's *daimonion* in the *Apology* and the *Symposium* is described as an internal voice of guidance, a structural-dispositional principle, not an external entity. Plato's myth of Er locates the daimon as the principle assigned to each soul at birth, structuring the trajectory of the life

that follows. The Christian narrowing of *daimon* to *demon*, an external malicious entity, is a fourth-century overlay; the original concept tracked installed disposition. To say a person had a particular daimon was to say something about how they were constituted, what patterns they were running, what trajectory was inscribed in their habit. The spirit of the person was the person's habituated character, not a separable substance riding it.

The most decisive evidence comes from the diagnostic logic older traditions used to identify a haunting. Across nearly every premodern culture, ghosts appear for the same reason, a structural break. The Roman *lemures* are those whose funerary rites were improperly performed; they appear to demand the rite be completed, and the Lemuralia ritual, the paterfamilias rising at midnight, casting black beans behind him with averted gaze, chanting nine times *manes exite paterni*, "ancestors of my fathers, depart", is the prescribed structural intervention. The medieval revenants catalogued by William of Newburgh appear because of unconfessed sin, broken oaths, unpaid debts, or sacraments left unperformed; the haunting resolves when the structural debt is paid. The Norse *draugr* is the badly-buried, the greedily-attached, the one with unavenged death; Glámr in *Grettis saga* returns precisely because he was buried in unhallowed ground after a bad death. The Japanese *onryō* is the wronged woman whose grievance remains unredressed; her haunting persists until the structural imbalance is rebalanced, often by deifying her as a protective *kami*. Patroclus's *eidolon* appears in *Iliad 23* specifically because his body lies unburied and his shade cannot cross into Hades. The pattern is universal. The ghost is not an autonomous entity that happens to linger; it is the symptom of a broken relation. The diagnostic question older traditions asked when confronted with a haunting was never "what kind of being is this?" It was always "what obligation has gone unmet?"

Beyond the diagnostic patterns, two passages in our older record articulate the structural reading explicitly, in the tradition's own voice. The first is from the *Analects* of Confucius, book three, passage twelve, 祭如在,祭神如神在, *jì rú zài, jì shén rú shén zài*, "sacrifice as if [the ancestors] were present, sacrifice to the spirits as if the spirits were present." The grammatical hinge is the particle *rú*, "as if." Confucius is not asserting that the ancestors are present. He is not asserting that they are absent either. He is explicitly

bracketing the metaphysical question and instructing the practitioner to perform the ritual as though presence obtained, because the structural relation, the descendant honoring the ancestor, the obligation maintained across generations, the pattern of filial piety reinforced, is what the ritual is doing. The ancestor functions as a structural participant in family life without any commitment, one way or the other, to where the ancestor is. This is the tradition refusing the literalist frame's question directly, in writing, in its foundational ethical text. Two and a half thousand years before the Cartesian recategorization that would force the literalist question on Western thought, the Confucian tradition had already declared the question malformed and described its practice in explicitly structural terms.

The second passage is the coinage by John S. Mbiti, in his 1969 work *African Religions and Philosophy: the living-dead*. Mbiti's argument is built from ethnographic study of African traditions across multiple language groups, and his observation is structural in exactly the sense our older Western vocabularies were. The ancestor is alive in memory and in the relations they organized, for about four to five generations, until the last person who personally knew them dies, at which point they pass into the impersonal *Zamani*, the deep-time substrate of the no-longer-personally-remembered. The boundary between living-dead and not is not metaphysical. It is generational. It is the threshold below which the installed pattern can no longer be sustained by the substrate that remembers it. Mbiti argues that the traditional African terminology was already tracking this distinction, and that the imported colonial term "ancestral spirits" obscures it by collapsing the structural living-dead category into a generic spiritual category. He advocates abolishing the imported terminology in favor of the indigenous, on the grounds that the indigenous was more accurate to what the practice was actually doing, maintaining a relation to a recently-deceased person whose installed patterns were still actively organizing the lives of those who had known them.

A further piece of evidence concerns the resolution older vocabularies had on what our modern term *ghost* has flattened. Premodern folk taxonomies distinguished, with care, between three structurally distinct conditions. Internal autonomous capture, what fired on its own schedule or what generated its own triggers, was named separately; Roman *genius*, Japanese *ikiryō*, Norse *hugr*. Episodic external visitation, what arrived and departed with

appropriate ritual, was named separately; Roman *lares*, Japanese *yūrei*. Location-bound residue, what was tethered to a place rather than a person, was named separately; Roman *lemures*, Japanese *jibakurei*, Norse *draugr*. The modern English word *ghost* flattens all three into a single undifferentiated category. Older vocabularies treated them as structurally distinct because they were tracking the firing mode and the substrate, not the identity of an imagined incorporeal being. Our flattening is a regression in resolution, not an advance in clarity.

Our older vocabulary was not bad metaphysics that we have since corrected. It was a good compression of a structural reality that we have since lost the language to name. Across breath-words, return-words, character-words, and the diagnostic logic that everywhere identifies a haunting as the symptom of a broken relation, older traditions were tracking what later analysis would have to reconstruct piecemeal, that patterns are installed, installation outlasts the originator, the substrate continues to execute, and the firing presents as external. The question that follows is how, exactly, the resolution was lost.

Our modern literalist frame is not a timeless default that a structural reading must overcome. It is a specific historical product, datable to particular sources, whose constituent parts are individually identifiable. The general dynamic of modernity retaining the structures older vocabulary named while losing the language for naming them has been mapped in earlier work on religion and on the drift of symbolic stacks from their referents. The work specific to our haunting vocabulary is narrower; identifying who literalized it, when, and through what mechanism. The arc has three layered shifts.

The first is Cartesian dualism, dating from 1641. Descartes recategorizes mind as a substance distinct from body, *res cogitans* and *res extensa*, two ontologically independent kinds of stuff capable of interaction across an unspecified interface. The pre-Cartesian Thomistic position, which had organized Christian theology for four centuries, treated soul not as a separable substance but as the form of the body, a pattern of organization, not a thing. On the Thomistic view, asking "where is the soul?" is a category mistake, like asking where the roundness of a wheel is located when the wheel is taken apart. The Cartesian move supplies, for the first time in the Western tradition, the metaphysical machinery a

literalist ghost would require; incorporeal substance, capable of occupying location, distinct from but interactive with material. Our folk concept "incorporeal entity occupying space" does not become coherent until this move has been made. Gilbert Ryle would later label the resulting picture "the ghost in the machine," recognizing that Cartesian dualism had produced precisely this folk concept. The critique arrived three centuries too late to undo the recategorization, but the diagnosis is right.

The second shift is Enlightenment empiricism in the eighteenth century. Locke and Hume accept the Cartesian framing of what a ghost would have to be, an incorporeal substance occupying a location, and then collapse the immaterial side of the Cartesian binary into "unreal." This is the move with the most lasting damage. The structural question, “is this person, place, or family repeatedly entered by an unresolved pattern?”, drops out of educated discourse, because the binary now recognizes only two positions: literal incorporeal presence, dismissed as superstition, or no phenomenon at all. The Enlightenment debunker and the Spiritualist believer share more than either would acknowledge. Both inherit the Cartesian conception of what is at stake. They disagree only about the answer.

The third shift is Modern Spiritualism, beginning in 1848. The Fox sisters' rappings at Hydesville in March of that year founded the movement. Within a decade, séances, mediums, automatic writing, and ectoplasm became a transatlantic mass phenomenon. By 1862, William Mumler is selling spirit photographs through the *Banner of Light*. Spiritualism doubles down on the Cartesian framework rather than rejecting it; it insists that the immaterial is real, but accepts the Cartesian description of what *immaterial* means, incorporeal substance, capable of occupying location, and distinct from material. The result is a culture-wide literalization with a visual grammar of translucent figures, sheeted apparitions, and ectoplasmic exudation that twentieth-century gothic and horror media will canonize and our contemporary paranormal entertainment continues to recycle. Our current popular ghost-image is essentially a Victorian product running on a Cartesian operating system.

The diagnosis matters because it locates the literalist frame as removable. It is not the natural endpoint of taking ghosts seriously, nor of treating them skeptically. It is a specific seventeenth-century recategorization, extended through an eighteenth-century empiricist binary, and industrialized through a nineteenth-century mediumistic mass movement. Both belief in literal ghosts and disbelief in them are downstream products of the same recategorization. Outside it, in the older vocabulary, or in the structural reading, the question "are ghosts real?" does not pose itself in those terms. The phenomenon is described and explained without the substance category the question presupposes. What looks today like default common sense is a four-hundred-year-old artifact, identifiable in its sources and separable from the phenomenon it has spent that time obscuring.

The mechanism that produces a haunting in an individual nervous system is not specific to that substrate. It runs identically on any substrate capable of installing policies through repeated interaction and continuing to execute them when the source of those policies is deleted. The substrate can be biological, social, organizational, civilizational, or linguistic. Where older vocabulary saw five different kinds of haunting requiring five different supernatural categories, the structural reading sees one mechanism instantiated in five different media. This is what older traditions were already tracking; not five different phenomena, but a scale-invariant pattern of pattern-persistence-past-source-deletion. The substrate changes. The kernel does not.

Trauma response is the canonical case, and my earlier work on it has already articulated the kernel; the event ends, but the body continues to behave as though it were ongoing; the past does not wound again, the present keeps reopening the wound. PTSD diagnostic literature, read at this angle, is a literature of haunting under another name. A cached response to an originating event fires on cues that no longer correspond to a live threat. The flashback is the ghost. The startle reaction triggered by a backfiring car is a response-policy installed by combat and still executing decades after combat ended. The avoidance pattern that keeps the survivor of a particular kind of assault out of a particular kind of room is a deleted-referent firing against environmental cue. None of this requires an entity. The substrate has been conditioned, the conditioning persists, the originating source

is gone, the firing continues. The deletion of the referent does not retire the cache; only structural recognition does. This is the smallest scale at which the mechanism is observable, and it is the scale at which our contemporary clinical vocabulary describes it accurately, even if without calling it haunting.

The mechanism scales up immediately to the family system. Bowen's multigenerational transmission process described what family-systems theorists had been observing for decades; roles, scripts, taboos, alliances, and emotional postures install during the formative life of a family and persist past the founder, often past the founder's living memory. The child of an alcoholic who never drinks but organizes her marriage around the anticipatory management of someone else's volatility is running a policy installed by a referent who no longer exists in her life. The grandchild of a person who survived a particular kind of violence behaves around food, money, or strangers in ways calibrated to a threat their grandparent registered and that they themselves have never encountered. Nicolas Abraham and Maria Török, working from the psychoanalytic side, gave this the name *transgenerational phantom*, or the family secret that passes forward as a foreign body in the descendant's psyche, the unspeakable thing that was never spoken and that the descendant nonetheless lives around. The structural feature worth marking is the doubled absence. The originator is dead; the memory of the originator's role in installing the policy is also gone. No one alive remembers what is being kept silent, yet the response-pattern continues to execute with full force. The substrate is running a cache against a referent that has been deleted twice over and reads the firing not as cached response but as personality, family character, or "how we are." This is the deleted-referent mechanism at its most exposed.

Institutions scale the same mechanism into the organizational substrate. The founder installs policies, risk preferences, hiring norms, decision rules, cultural taboos, and ritual practices during the formative period when the institution is shaping itself against a particular strategic environment. The founder dies, retires, or moves on. The strategic environment changes. The policies remain. "We've always done it this way" is a haunting in the technical sense, a cached response firing against a referent that no longer arrives. Defense bureaucracies maintain force postures calibrated to opponents who have

restructured beyond recognition. Family businesses run the founder's risk preferences a generation after his death, optimizing against a competitive landscape that has dissolved. Religious institutions execute rituals whose original ecological referents of harvest cycles, tribal boundaries, sacrificial economies, and the particular epidemiological conditions of a vanished landscape have evaporated, leaving the ritual to fire against an environment it no longer fits. Bureaucracies maintain reporting structures designed for the information technologies of three decades ago. The institution lacks introspective access to its own conditioning. It experiences the cached policy as "how things must be done," not as a response to something that is no longer there. Reform efforts that try to address the policy directly fail because they treat the haunting as a current decision rather than as a deleted-referent firing; the institution defends the policy with the conviction appropriate to a live threat, because at the level of subjective experience inside the institution, the threat still feels present even when no one can specify what it is.

At the civilizational scale the mechanism becomes diffuse enough that the substrate is harder to point at, but the structural form is identical. Cold War frames continue to organize policy communities, defense doctrines, and threat assessments of governments more than three decades after the bipolar world that produced them dissolved. The actors are the same kinds of actors, the deliberations have the same kinds of deliberations, the analytical categories of containment, sphere of influence, and deterrence have the shape they had during the bipolar era; only the referent against which those categories were calibrated is gone. Theological residues structure secular ethics in similar ways. Moral intuitions whose original framework of divine command, eschatological accountability, and ensoulment metaphysics has been disavowed at the doctrinal level continue to execute as policies in the substrate of educated common sense, where they are read not as the residue of a vacated framework but as the bedrock of universal reason. Mark Fisher's diagnosis of "lost futures" describes the same mechanism in reverse; the affective trace of social-democratic and modernist horizons that never arrived continues to organize the present's sense of what is possible, even when the institutional substrate that would have realized those horizons has been deliberately dismantled. The civilization is haunted, and it does not

know what by. The deleted referent, the prior cognitive ecology in which the policy made sense, the future that was foreclosed, the framework that was abandoned, is not even available for inspection. The substrate has lost the ability to recognize its own conditioning as conditioning and reads its cached responses as the structure of reality itself. At this scale, haunting and worldview are indistinguishable.

Language itself is the fifth substrate, and the one in which the mechanism becomes hardest to see, because the medium is also the means by which any recognition would have to occur. Dead metaphors structure reasoning. The word *ghost* is now a ghost. Its original structural referent, the breath-as-pattern, the agitation of life, the frequentation of a place by a custom, has been deleted, and what remains is a term that continues to fire against a substance category that does not exist. *Spiritus*, which named the moving pattern of breath that constitutes a living being, now means what Descartes meant by mental substance; *haunt*, which named the act of frequenting a place or returning to a practice, now means what Spiritualism meant by spectral visitation. The substrate of language has been conditioned by four centuries of literalization, and the conditioning fires every time a contemporary English speaker uses the word *ghost* with the literalist sense it has acquired. The vocabulary itself has become a haunting; words executing meanings their original referents would not recognize, against substance categories that came into existence to fill slots the words themselves had created. Our language is haunted by its own etymology.

Five scales, one mechanism. The substrate changes; the structural form does not. What looks at first like five different phenomena requiring five different vocabularies, psychiatry for the individual, family-systems theory for the familial, organizational theory for the institutional, history of ideas for the civilizational, and etymology for the linguistic, is, at the level of structure, the same mechanism instantiated in five different media. This is what our older vocabulary was already saying before literalization severed it from its referent. Premodern traditions, in their unscientific compression, named the invariant directly. Modern disciplines, in their separate vocabularies, have had to reconstruct it piecemeal, without recognizing that the thing they were reconstructing was already named. One implication sharpens at this point. If the mechanism runs at every scale of any substrate that

installs policies, then the substrate that has been doing the most efficient instantiation of it is not the substrate one would expect.

Our premodern vocabulary, *haunt*, *gāst*, *spiritus*, *daimon*, *manes*, *yūrei*, *preta*, *guǐ*, was tracking the structural reality of installed patterns persisting past the deletion of their sources. That tracking had a referent in an older cognitive ecology. The cultures in which these words were operational were organized around ritual, memorial, oath, obligation, and ancestor-relation. In that ecology, "haunting" was a transparent and accurate description of how patterns persist through living substrates. The vocabulary was not metaphysical speculation. It was operational description, calibrated to the practices it named.

That ecology has been deleted. Modern Western culture that inherited the words no longer maintains their lived practices of ancestor veneration, oath-economy, ritual memorial, or fine-grained obligation tracking that made the older vocabulary a working description of ordinary experience. The cognitive substrate that grounded the words has been replaced. The Cartesian-Spiritualist-mediated successor culture does not have the practices our older words named and does not have the perceptual habits our older traditions used to recognize when those practices failed, but the vocabulary persists. The cache has not been updated. We continue to use the old words *ghost*, *spirit*, *haunt*, and *possessed*, yet the substrate that grounded them is gone. The words fire against a referent that has been deleted.

Our culture continues to debate a question, "are ghosts real?", that no longer corresponds to what the original tradition was asking. The original tradition was not asking whether incorporeal entities occupy spatial locations. It was articulating how broken obligations, unfinished rites, and installed patterns continue to organize the living. Our modern question is a literalization of the older vocabulary's surface, applied to a substrate that has lost what that vocabulary was naming. The believer answers the literalized question affirmatively; the debunker answers it negatively; both have already lost what the question was originally for. The literalist supernatural frame is, therefore, itself a haunting. It is a response-pattern, the cached cultural use of supernatural vocabulary, firing against a deleted referent, the older cognitive ecology in which the vocabulary made structural sense,

and mistaken by its host, our culture itself, for an external presence, the question of whether literal ghosts exist. The popular reading of haunting is haunted by an insight it has lost access to.

Recognition is itself the exorcism. Not the exorcism of ghosts, but the exorcism of the ghost of an old accurate intuition that our culture has stopped being able to see. The supernatural frame is the most successful instance of the mechanism it has spent four centuries misnaming. Our culture is, collectively, executing a cached response against a deleted referent and reading the firing as evidence of an entity. This is what Cartesian-Spiritualist-trained intuition feels like from inside. The believer's certainty that something is there and the debunker's certainty that nothing is there are the same haunting wearing two faces, the affirmation and the denial of a question whose original meaning has been gone for four hundred years.

The right question is not whether ghosts are real. It is what response-patterns we are executing against referents that no longer exist. That question recovers what *gāst*, *hantise*, *manes*, *yūrei*, *preta*, and *guǐ* were always pointing at. It also recovers the diagnostic edge those traditions had; they knew what to do about hauntings. Complete the rite. Pay the debt. Fulfill the obligation. Perform the work of mourning. Stated in structural terms, identify the policy, locate the deletion, retire the cache, free the substrate. Premodern remedies were not magical procedures. They were structural interventions in the right place. Our literalist frame, having lost the structural reading, also lost the remedy. It replaced the remedy with the pseudo-remedy of debunking, which cannot retire a cache because it refuses to recognize the cache.

Ryle was right that there is no ghost in the machine, in the sense he meant no incorporeal substance riding the body. But there is something in the machine, and what is in the machine is exactly what the old word *haunt* was already naming when it meant *to frequent*, *to habituate*. The machine is haunted by its habits. The ghost in the machine is the machine's habit. That is the only ghost there has ever been. Traditions that named it were not naïve; they were precise. The literalism that succeeded them is our haunting.

References

James, B. (2026). *The Power of Possession, revisited*. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMTPO-63

James, B. (2025). *There is no before, only symbols we insist upon*. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMTIN